major penalty has been instituted in a case despite the fact that the charged officer has not been found guilty by the inquiring authority;

(b) whether imposition of Censure nullifies the recommendations kept is sealed cover;

(c) if so, whether posts against which sealed cover procedure was followed and were kept vacant during entire inquiry period may be clubbed with current year vacancies and normal and special zones of consideration may be extended; and

(d) in what manner the charged officer is protected against second penalty of supersession?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) There are no instructions to keep the posts vacant when sealed cover procedure is adopted.

(d) The Charged Officer may prefer appeal.

Revision of Civil Services Examination

1491. SHRIMATI KANIMOZHI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the present system of Civil Service Examinations results in unequal advantages to the candidates selecting different optional subjects;

(b) the reasons for testing knowledge of the candidates in subjects not directly relevant to the job (administration) for which they are being selected, in Civil Services Examinations; and

(c) whether Government propose to revise the present system of Civil Services Examinations to make it more objective and relevant?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Restricting the testing in a few compulsory subjects would drastically reduce the base for recruitment and also discourage otherwise deserving candidates from taking the examination.

(c) The recommendation of Prof. Y. K. Alagh Committee on the review of Civil Services Examination are under consideration of the Administrative Reforms Commission.

Cases referred to CVC

1492. SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases referred by Government to the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) in the last three years;

(b) whether the Commission has submitted their report in these cases;

(c) the number of cases in which the Commission has reported that there is no evidence against the officials concerned, number of cases in which prosecutions have been recommended and number of cases in which prosecution have been filed; and

(d) **the** details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): (a) and (b) The number of cases referred by the Government and advice tendered by the *CVC* in the last three years is as follows:—

Year	No. of Cases Referred	No. of Cases in which advice tendered
2005 to 2007	8269	7713

(c) and (d) The details of cases during the last three years where the CVC has advised closure of cases, recommended for launching prosecution and sanction of prosecution of officials is as follows:—

Years	No. of cases where in commission advised for closure of the case	No. of cases where the launching of prosecution has been advised by the Commission	No. of cases where the authorities concerned have given sanction for launching of prosecution
2005 to 2007	5109	446	444

Status of cases under RTI Act

1493. SHRI M.V. MYSURA REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the number of cases in which Public Information Officer (PIO) did not turn up despite repeated summons and number of cases in which powers under section 18 of RTI Act have been used;

(b) the number of cases which PIO rejected by wrongly applying section 8 or section 7(9) of the above Act;

(c) the number of cases investigated;

(d) the appeals and complaints presented to the commission, month-wise;

(e) the total number of cases returned for incomplete documents/technical grounds and number of cases admitted for hearing;

(f) the number of cases in which the concerned files have been lost; and

(g) the number of cases which PIO reported that records are not traceable?